REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the following amendments and remarks contained herein in response to the Advisory Action mailed July 20, 2006. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment and remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 19 remain pending. In particular, Applicants amend claims 1 – 19. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Truong spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner during a telephone discussion on August 22, 2006 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Truong indicated that the amendments included herein distinguish the claims from the cited art. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Truong carefully consider this response and the amendments.

II.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the cited art reference must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981). Further, "[t]he PTO has the burden under section 103 to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. It can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of

ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references." *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

A.   Claims 1 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*

1.   Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2003/0023691 ("*Knauerhase*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,007,068 ("*Morkel*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising the steps of:
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an instant messaging (IM) address of a contact of a sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an email address of the contact of the sender;
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the contact of the sender;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the IM address to the sender defined reference identifier;
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the email address to the sender defined reference identifier (ID); and
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an *IM session with the contact from the email window. (emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, *Knauerhase* appears to disclose "systems and techniques… that

enable a sender to send a message to a recipient's identity" (p. 1, paragraph [0014]).

Additionally, *Morkel* appears to disclose "a system for disseminating contact information via a network" (col. 2, line 59). However, none of the cited references appear to disclose a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising the steps of... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an *IM session with the contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

2. Claims 2 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 2 – 5. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 5 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

B. Claims 6 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*

1. Claim 6 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of U.S. Publication Number

2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

> A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising the steps of:
>
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, sender input, the sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
>
> receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
>
> correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID); and
>
> providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an *IM session with the individual contact from the email window. (emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, *Knauerhase* appears to disclose "systems and techniques... that enable a sender to send a message to a recipient's identity" (p. 1, paragraph [0014]). Additionally, *Donovan* appears to disclose "an apparatus for providing instant messaging (IM) on and through the Internet across various platforms" (p. 1, paragraph [0002]). However, none of the cited references appear to disclose a "method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising the steps of... providing, by the computing device at the sender location, an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for launching an *IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

2. Claim 11 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of U.S. Publication Number 2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. More specifically, claim 11 recites:

> A system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising:
> first receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the first receive logic configured to receive first sender input, the first sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;
> second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second sender input comprising a reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact;
> correlate logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the correlate logic configured to correlate each of the multiple IM addresses to the reference identifier (ID), the reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact; and
> email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window. (emphasis added)*

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements. More specifically, *Knauerhase* appears to disclose "systems and techniques... that

enable a sender to send a message to a recipient's identity" (p. 1, paragraph [0014]).

Additionally, *Donovan* appears to disclose "an apparatus for providing instant messaging (IM) on and through the Internet across various platforms" (p. 1, paragraph [0002]). However, none of the cited references appear to disclose a "system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising... email window logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the email window logic configured to provide an email window configured to utilize the reference identifier (ID) for *launching an IM session with the individual contact from the email window*" as recited in claim 11, as amended. For at least this reason, claim 11, as amended, is allowable over the cited art.

3. Claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 7 – 10 and 12 – 19. More specifically, dependent claims 7 – 10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 6. Further, dependent claims 12 – 19 arc believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 11. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Further, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony F. Bonner Jr., Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
  HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

Customer No.: 38823